



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,284	06/27/2003	Surendra N. Naidoo	4017-02804	7882

30652 7590 11/08/2005

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5700 GRANITE PARKWAY, SUITE 330
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER

RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2643

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 23, 29-31, 53, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nabavi (GB 2325548) in view of Nadooshan (US PAT: 6,161,182) and Katz (US PAT: 5,412,708).

Regarding claims 23, 53, 58, and 59, Nabavi discloses a method for remote monitoring of a premises, the method comprising: operatively coupling remote client to a security system server (10, fig. 1), the security system server being capable of authenticating a user of the remote client (9, fig. 1), operatively coupling the remote client to a security gateway (reads on 1, fig. 1), the security gateway being capable of managing the monitoring one or more portions of the premises, verifying the identification of the user of the remote client, transferring information between the security gateway and the remote client, wherein user is at a location which is geographically remote from the premises, security gateway (1, fig. 1) is operably coupled to at least one camera (6, fig. 1)/audio station (page 7, line 23 – page 8, line 2) located at the premises (figs. 1-3, page 6, line 3 – page 7, line 22).

Nabavi differs from claims 23, 53, 58-59 in that he does not teach the following: activating a signal at the premises for notifying an occupant at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring, security gateway provides an audiovisual signal at the premises

Art Unit: 2643

for notifying an occupant at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring; transmitting access token from the security system server to the remote client, providing the security gateway with information about the user and the access token, access token is adapted to allow the remote client to access the security gateway based on a permission profile for the user, wherein permission profile for the user is created by a general administrator.

However, Katz teaches the following: activating a signal at the premises for notifying an occupant at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring, security gateway provides an audiovisual signal at the premises for notifying an occupant at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring (fig. 1, col. 10 lines 46-58); and Nadooshan teaches the following: transmitting access token from the security system server (reads on 300, fig. 1) to the remote client (400, fig. 1), providing the security gateway (for example 145, fig. 1) with information about the user and the access token, access token is adapted to allow the remote client to access the security gateway based on a permission profile for the user, wherein permission profile for the user is created by a general administrator (general administrator is implied in as much as each computer system has an administrator to create user access profiles etc, figs. 1-2, col. 3, line 66 – col. 5, line 30).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Nabavi's system to provide for the following: activating a signal at the premises for notifying an occupant at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring, security gateway provides an audiovisual signal at the premises for

Art Unit: 2643

notifying an occupant at the premises that remote monitoring is occurring as this arrangement would facilitate to notify the affected users that monitoring is taking place as taught by Katz, thus avoiding clandestine activity that might affect the customers privacy rights; transmitting access token from the security system server to the remote client, providing the security gateway with information about the user and the access token, access token is adapted to allow the remote client to access the security gateway based on a permission profile for the user, wherein permission profile for the user is created by a general administrator as this arrangement would provide, one of the methods, among many possible methods, of securing access to the valuable resources as taught by Nadooshan.

Nabavi differs from claims 29-31 in that he does not teach the following: access token allows to specific features of the security gateway according to permission profile for the user, token allows access to one or more designated cameras/auto stations located at the premises.

However, Nadooshan teaches the following: access token allows to specific features of the security gateway according to permission profile for the user, token allows access to one or more designated remote equipments located at the premises (col. 2 lines 30-48).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Nabavi's system to provide for the following: access token allows to specific features of the security gateway according to permission profile for the user, token allows access to one or more designated cameras/auto stations

Art Unit: 2643

located at the premises as this arrangement would facilitate restricting access to the desired equipment features only to authorized users as taught by Nadooshan, thus protecting remote equipment from unauthorized users.

3. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nabavi in view of Nadooshan and Katz as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Reginer et al. (US PAT: 5,689,708, hereinafter Reginer).

Regarding claim 24, the combination does not explicitly teach the following: general administrator of security system is capable of modifying permission profile for the user.

However, Reginer discloses client server computer system which teaches the following: system administrator modifying user profile to provide different application contexts (col. 10 lines 26-40)

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: general administrator of security system is capable of modifying permission profile for the user as this arrangement would facilitate user needs to use the system as taught by Reginer

4. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nabavi in view of Nadooshan and Katz as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Gullaman et al. (US PAT: 5,280,527, hereinafter Gullaman).

Regarding claim 25, the combination does not teach the following: verifying the identification of the user comprises authenticating biometric data.

Art Unit: 2643

However, Gullaman teaches the following: verifying the identification of the user comprises authenticating biometric data (col. 2 lines 28-39).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: verifying the identification of the user comprises authenticating biometric data as this arrangement would provide another well known means for authenticating the user as taught by Gullaman.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Melur Ramakrishnaiah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2643